



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,266	12/04/2003	Matthew P.J. Baker	B 34,320A	7101
24737 7590 06/11/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			MUI, GARY	
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Commence	10/728,266	BAKER, MATTHEW P.J.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gary Mui	2616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was precised to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 December</u></li> <li>This action is <b>FINAL</b>. 2b) ☐ This</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise.</li> </ol>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 3-7,9-13 and 15-27 is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 3-7,9-13,15-19,21-23 and 25-27 is/are 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 20 and 24 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. e rejected.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	re: a) accepted or b) object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No. <u>09/488,031</u> . ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/728,266

Art Unit: 2616

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Priority**

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/488,031, filed on Jan. 20, 2000.

## Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed on Dec. 04, 2003 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because it is are strongly discouraged from submitting a list that includes copies of PTO/SB/08\*\* or PTO-892 forms from other applications. A completed PTO/SB/08\*\* form from another application may already have initials of an examiner and the application number of another application. This information will likely confuse the record. Furthermore, when the spaces provided on the form have initials of an examiner, there are no spaces available next to the documents listed for the examiner of the subsequent application to provide his or her initials, and the previously relevant initials may be erroneously construed as being applied for the current application. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/728,266

Art Unit: 2616

#### **Double Patenting**

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 3 - 7, 9 - 13, 15, 16, and 25 - 27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 - 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,881. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications discloses a method and an apparatus of correcting timing errors when transmitting isochronous data through a packet based communication network. The current application simply narrows the claims of that found in U.S. Patent No. 6,661,881.

Art Unit: 2616

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 17 – 19 and 21 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Staats (US 6,418,150).

For claims 17 and 21, Staats teaches processing isochronous time stamped data packets, comprising synchronizing in frequency clocks in the transmitting/receiving system, and relating the time of processing of a currently received transmission time stamped data packet to the time of processing of a first transmission time stamped data packet (see column 2 lines 47 - 59, the system synchronizes the clock according to an offset value between the first time synchronized event and a second time synchronized event).

For claims 18 and 22, Staats teaches storing the absolute time of receipt of the first transmission time stamped data packet, storing a given time offset equal to or greater than the maximum variation in time between successive received data packets, and processing the first transmission time stamped data packet at a time interval corresponding to said given time offset after said absolute time (see column 3 lines 10 - 23 and column 6 line 53 - column 7 line 18, the cycle time register and cycle clock offset).

For claims 19 and 23, Staats teaches a currently received transmission time stamped data packet is processed at a time corresponding to the time difference between the transmission

timestamps of the current data packet and first data packet, after the processing of the first data packet (see column 3 lines 10 – 23).

Page 5

## Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 20 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ravikanth (US 6,327,274), Acampora et al. (US 6,266,384), Jain (US 6,259,677), Ohlsson et al. (US 6,452,950), Eidson (US 6,278,710), Burns 6,449,291), Averbuch et al. (US 6,160,805), Strong (US 6,335,931), Fujimori et al. (US 6,243,395), Huh (US 6,021,168), Ngo (US 6,510,150), Staats (US 6,621,832), and Staats (US 2002/0172226).
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Mui whose telephone number is (571) 270-1420. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. Thurs. 9 3 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/728,266

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR' only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 6